

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. FACTS AND PROCEDURE.....	4
A. The Comfort Access Defect.....	4
B. Named Plaintiff's Lease and Purchase of a Class Vehicle with Comfort Access Defect.....	4
C. Myers Experienced The Comfort Access Defect.....	5
D. Myers and Class Members Were Not Aware of The Defect	6
E. BMW's Knowledge of The Defect.....	6
F. BMW Refuses to Rectify The Problem	7
G. Claimed Losses	7
H. The Class Action Complaint Against BMW	7
I. Preliminary Approval.....	8
J. Investigation And Discovery	8
K. The Settlement Agreement	9
L. The Settlement	10
1. The Settlement Class.....	10
2. The Payment and Reimbursement Schedule.....	10
3. The Owners' Manual Insert	11
4. The Notice to the Class	11
5. The Release of the Class	12
6. Claims Administration/Notice	12
III. ARGUMENT	13
A. The Court Should Approve The Settlement As Fair, Reasonable And Adequate ...	13
B. The Settlement and The Benefits It Provides Warrant Final Approval	15
C. The Risks Inherent In Continued Litigation And Trial Support Final Approval.....	16
D. The Settlement Eliminates The Risk of Decertification Or Other Challenge to Class Action Status Through Trial	17

E.	The Extent of Discovery And The Stage of the Proceedings Favor Settlement Approval	18
F.	The Recommendations of Experienced Counsel Favor Approval Of the Settlement	19
G.	No Attorneys General Object.....	19
H.	Class Members' Positive Reaction Warrants Final Approval	19
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Acosta v. Trans Union, LLC</i> , 243 F.R.D. 377 (C.D. Cal. 2007).....	16
<i>American Honda Motor Co., Inc. v. Superior Court</i> , 199 Cal. App. 4th 1367 (2011).....	17
<i>Browning v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i> , 2007 WL 4105971 14 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2007)	15, 16, 17, 18
<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> , 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992)	13
<i>Daniel v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 2013 WL 3146810 (E.D. Cal. June 18 2013)	14
<i>Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co.</i> , 144 Cal. App. 4th 824 (Cal. Ct. App. 2006)	15
<i>Edwards v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 2012 WL 2866424 (S.D. Cal. June 12, 2012).....	15
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir.1998)	14, 15, 18
<i>Hartless v. Clorox Co.</i> , 273 F.R.D. 630 (S.D. 2011).....	17
<i>Henderson v. Volvo Cars a/North America</i> , Case No. 09-4146-CCCJAD (D.N. 2012)	14
<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrand Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 928133 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	14
<i>In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.</i> , 288 F.3d 1012 (7th Cir. 2002).....	15
<i>In Re General Motors Dex-Cool Products Liability Litigation</i> , 241 F.R.D. 305 (S.D. Ill. 2007) ...	15
<i>In re Netflix Privacy Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 1120801 (N.D. Cal. March 18, 2013).....	18
<i>In Re. Hyundai and Kia Fuel Economy Litigation</i> , No. 15-56014, Dkt. No. 136	16
<i>Marcus v. BMW of N. Am., LLC</i> , 2012 WL 3171560 (3d Cir. Aug.7, 2012)	17
<i>Mazza v. American Honda Motor Co.</i> , 666 F.3d 581 (9th Cir. 2012).....	16
<i>Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> , 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004)	13
<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n</i> , 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982).....	12
<i>Samuel-Bassett v. Kia Motors America, Inc.</i> , 34 A.3d 1 (Penn. Dec 2, 2011)	14, 16
<i>Staton v. Boeing</i> , 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003)	12
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011)	16

Statutes

28 U.S.C. §1715.....	18
----------------------	----

Federal Rule Civil Procedure 23.....	12, 14
--------------------------------------	--------

Treatises

4 NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS (4th ed.).....	13
---	----